DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 932 AC 008 911

AUTHOR Battistelli, Vince P.; Minnis, John R.
TITLE Evaluation and Review of Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965, Florida, 1966-70.
PUB DATE Aug 70
NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Colleges, *Community Service Programs, Federal Aid, *Program Evaluation, *State Programs, Statistical Data, *Universities
IDENTIFIERS Florida, *Higher Education Act of 1965 (Title I)

ABSTRACT

The review and evaluation of 1966-1970 Community Service programs in Florida dealt with the office of the State Coordinator, the Advisory Committee, and the processes of communication, review, selection, and administration of Title I funds; and referred to projects and all aspects associated with these. Projects were classified into five problem areas but the majority were in Human Resource Development, and major effect was in educational enrichment of senior citizens and educational guidance and programs for women. To achieve maximal participation, emphasis was placed on communication flow between the institution and the community, interest groups, and/or target groups. Over 95% of the directors acknowledged the importance of interagency cooperation; 98% used mass media for dissemination of information. Followup activities were carried out by 75% of the institutions. Thirty-five percent of the projects had an effect on changing the status of the department within the institution, while the remaining 65% indicated no change. Absence of adequate evaluation reports was the major weakness of Title I funded projects. (Listed are projects funded, institutional source, year of funding, and amount given.) (NL)

ED045932

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION AND REVIEW OF TITLE 1, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

FLORIDA, 1966-70

A REPORT SUBMITTED
TO THE FLORIDA BOARD OF REGENTS,
STATE AGENCY FOR TITLE 1
OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965
STATE OF FLORIDA AUGUST 1970

AC 000 911

ED045932

EVALUATION AND REVIEW

OF

TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

FLORIDA, 1966-70

Conducted by
Vince P. Battistelli and John R. Minnis

A Report Submitted to the Florida Board of Regents,
State Agency for Title I of the
Higher Education Act of 1965

August 1970

August 1970

Mr. Sidney S. Henry, State Coordinator
Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965
Florida Board of Regents
107 W. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Dear Mr. Henry:

We are pleased to submit this review and evaluation report on Title I funded programs through and up to June 1970. The evaluation has provided us both with a unique and exciting challenge, one that allowed for valuable experiences and insights into the role of the community service programs as it pertains to the various institutions of higher education in Florida.

The difficulties we faced in our evaluation lay in the varied nature, complexity, and number of projects initiated under Title I. In an attempt to offer a concise and forthright evaluation, our immediate priority lay in setting our objectives and establishing a flexible methodological framework. We relied heavily on questionnaires and interviews with project directors, community leaders, and project staff. In addition, much information has been gleaned from project proposals, evaluation reports, and other data in your office.

The results, interpretations, and recommendations have been made based on the above mentioned data sources. We feel our efforts and recommendations are honest and objective.

We would like to acknowledge the cooperation and assistance received from all project directors interviewed, and express our thanks to you and your staff for the consideration shown us while conducting our study.

Sincerely,

Vince P. Battistelli

John R. Minnis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Title Page	
Letter of Submission	i
Table of Contents	II
List of Tables	iii
Foreword	iv
Introduction	1
Project Review	1
Classification	4
Problem Area	4
Types	13
Continuation Funding	14
Similar Projects	15
Geographic and Institution Distribution	16
Funding by Counties	17
Presentation of Data -- Tables	20
Questionnaire and Interview Findings	24
Comments and Conclusions	33
Evaluation Criteria - Individual Projects	36
Evaluation Criteria - Title I State Program	39
Recommendations	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Institutions, Projects, and Funds by State Designated Problem Areas, FY 66-70	4
2	Distribution of Projects and Funding by Type of Institution, FY 66-70.	12
3	Distribution of Projects and Funds by State Designated Problem Areas, FY 66-70	13
4	Projects Funded for More Than One Year	14
5	Distribution of Projects and Funding by Counties, FY 66-70	17
6	Counties, Institutions, and Populations.	19
7	Distribution of Participants by Sex: 1966-70. . . .	20
8	Distribution of Participants by Age: 1966-70. . . .	20
9	Distribution of Participants by Education Level: 1966-70.	21
10	Distribution of Participants by Social Class: 1966-70.	21
11	Distribution of Participants by Problem Area: 1966-70.	22
12	Distribution of Participants by Problem Area and Social Class: 1966-70	23

Figure

1	Locations of Institutions Sponsoring Projects. . . .	18

FOREWORD

Since its inception in 1965, Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has afforded the institutions of higher education in Florida an excellent opportunity to mobilize resources and energy directed to the solution of rural, urban, and community-wide problems.

This evaluation has concerned itself with an examination of projects which have been classified according to the following problem areas:

I. Human Relations and Minority Groups

- A. Assimilation of Cuban Refugees
- B. Education for Migrant Agricultural Workers
- C. Improvement of Human Affairs in Metropolitan Areas
- D. Action Programs to Re-establish Communication in Poverty Areas Between Indigenous Groups and Those in Positions of Authority

II. Urban-Rural Public Administration

- A. Public Administration
- B. Community Leadership Development
- C. Education for Public Responsibility
- D. Personnel Management, Agricultural
- E. Procedures to Counteract Water Pollution

III. Education for Economic Development and Full-Time Employment

- A. Continuing Education and Training for the Professional, Technology, and Service Fields
- B. Cooperative Education, Dropouts

IV. Human Resource Development

- A. Individual and Family Development
- B. Problems of the Aging
- C. Continuing Education for Women
- D. Adult Literacy Programs

V. Education and Community Welfare

A. Marriage and Family Life

B. Natural Resources

C. Continuing Education, Florida State Prisoners

D. Housing

The evaluation reflects pertinent data regarding the activities and the involvement of university, college, and junior college resources in community service programs involving over 57,000 participants.

Since 1965, seventeen institutions of higher education have been allocated federal funds in an amount totaling $1,075,272.26.

INTRODUCTION

The following report is a review and evaluation of programs funded under Title I, Higher Education Act, 1965, in the State of Florida and covers the years 1966 through 1970. In all, we will be concerned with seventy-five programs, seventeen of which were funded for more than one year.

This review and evaluation was requested by the State Coordinator for Title I and the Title I Advisory Committee in the fall of 1969, to determine the statewide impact of Title I on solving community problems or on strengthening the community service programs in colleges and universities. Both the Advisory Committee and the State Coordinator felt that further funding of programs should be based on the knowledge of what had occurred as a result of projects to date, on the knowledge of weaknesses and strengths of the Title I program and on an updated report of needs and problem areas in the state.

A primary request by the State Coordinator and the Advisory Committee was that the review consist of internal and external components. The internal component refers to the office of the State Coordinator, the Advisory Committee, and the processes of communication, review, selection, and administration of Title I funds. The external component refers to the projects and all aspects associated with these.

The original Title I State Plan for Florida outlined nine objectives in addition to those stated in the Federal Act, providing us with two related sets of guidelines on which to design the evaluation.

The design of the evaluation centered on questionnaires constructed for project directors, community leaders, target groups, and staff. Another integral source of information was provided by a series of personal interviews with selected project directors throughout the state. Other major sources of information were project evaluations, proposals, and progress reports filed in the office of the State Coordinator. Factors such as insufficient records, time limitations, lack of availability of project staff, community leaders and participants for purposes of interviewing, and the restriction of a two-man evaluating team affected the comprehensiveness of this report.

PROJECT REVIEW

Problem Area I, Human Relations and Minority Groups, identifies two groups of people to whom projects may be directed. These groups are (1) migrant farm workers, and (2) Cuban refugees.

Of the seven projects funded (three received continuation funds) in this problem area, six were programs designed to assist with the problems of minority groups and one was designed to assist with the problems of migrant farm workers.

Projects in Problem Area II, Urban-Rural Public Administration, were aimed at assisting public administrators and elected officials in dealing with such areas as business management, finance and control, human relations and community change, public affairs programs and inter-agency cooperation and coordination. In addition, projects in this problem area were to direct themselves to assisting persons preparing for or holding positions of public responsibility, by improving communication skills, developing knowledge of public affairs, social change, and political forces.

Nine out of ten projects funded in this problem area directed themselves toward accomplishing the objectives as stated above.

The prime concern of Problem Area III, Education for Economic Development, is the education of future professional and technical personnel to meet the growing demands of our highly mechanized, industrial, and science-centered society and the re-education and continuing education of practicing professional and technical personnel.

Of the seven projects funded in this area, only two are aimed at the target group indicated. The remaining five are concerned with economic development for a broader target audience, such as economic counseling for smaller communities, consumer education, cooperative education for dropouts, etc.

Problem Area IV, Human Resource Development, identifies four areas of concern to which Title I funded projects may direct their energies. These are individual and family development, problems of the aging, continuing education for women, and adult literacy programs.

Of the fourteen projects funded in this area, three were concerned with continuing education for women, eight were programs directed to problems of the aging, one was directed to individual and family development, and the remaining two fall into the category of adult literacy programs.

The projects in Problem Area V, Education and Community Welfare, have focused on two of the problem area's three suggested concerns--housing and health. No project has been funded that concerns itself with natural resources. One project, Building for Successful Marriage and Family Life, was misplaced under Problem Area IV.

It should be noted that no projects were funded in this problem area during 1966 or 1967. Three were funded in 1968, one in 1969, and two in 1970.

SUMMARY AND COMMENTS

The data presented regarding problem areas suggests to the evaluators the necessity of reviewing:

1. The validity of the various sub-problems in each Problem Area.

2. The extent to which institutions of higher education in the state have been encouraged to direct their energies to these problem areas.

3. The availability of resources within institutions to work on these problem areas.

4. The fact that projects in Problem Area I occurred only in four urban areas of the state.

5. That Title I has not adequately responded to the problem areas of Adult Literacy, Individual and Family Development, and Natural Resources, which have been of major concern nationally.

6. That within each problem area the sub-problems have received far from equal attention. In most cases it seems to the evaluators that the sub-problems receiving least attention are those that should be receiving the most attention. It appears to the evaluators that the approval committee has established priorities within each problem area or that projects have been submitted that relate to only one or two of the sub-problems within each major problem area.

7. That some projects bear little or no relationship to the problem area in which they were funded (see preceding section, Problem Area V).

8. That distribution of projects throughout the state in some problem areas are in some cases rather limited. This is particularly true of projects in Problem Area I.

CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECTS BY PROBLEM AREA

The seventy-five projects approved and funded by the state coordinator's office were designed to attack or develop a better understanding of a problem identified in one of the five major problem areas designated in the state plan. The five problem areas include the nine target areas outlined in the Federal Act.

The largest number of projects were in Problem Area IV, Human Resource Development, and the major effort of these projects was directed toward educational enrichment of senior citizens and educational guidance and programs for women.

TABLE 1

INSTITUTIONS, PROJECTS, AND FUNDS BY STATE DESIGNATED PROBLEM AREAS, FY 66-70

Institution	Program Title	Federal Funds
Problem Area I - Human Relations and Minority Groups		
	1966	
University of Miami	An Urban Extension and Cultural Program for the Cuban (Refugee) Adult in the Greater Miami Area	$ 661.00
University of Miami	A Human Affairs and Minority and Civil Rights Study and Educational Program for Metropolitan Adults	$ 2,200.00
	Total (1966)	$ 2,861.00
	1967	
University of Miami	An Urban Extension and Cultural Program for the Cuban (Refugee) Adult in the Greater Miami Area	$ 16,309.50
Florida Atlantic University	Use of TV Taping, Evaluation, Programmed Instruction and/or Other Media to Provide Practical Experiences for Counselors, Social Workers, and Health Workers in Serving Children of Migrant Farm Workers	$ 20,000.00
University of Miami	A Human Affairs and Minority and Civil Rights Study and Educational Program for Metropolitan Area Adults	$ 12,426.00
	Total (1967)	$ 48,735.50

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Institution	Program Title	Federal Funds
Problem Area I (cont.)	1968	
University of Miami	An Urban Extension and Culture Program for the Cuban (Refugee) Adult in the Greater Miami Area	$ 3,155.50
Florida A & M University	A Conference to Develop Guidelines for a Long-Range Program of Public Service and Continuing Education on Urban Problems	$ 8,657.90
	Total (1968)	$ 11,813.40
	1969	
University of Miami	An Urban Extension and Cultural Program for the Cuban (Refugee) Adult in the Great Miami Area	$ 15,000.00
University of Miami	A Human Affairs and Minority and Civil Rights Study and Educational Program for Metropolitan Area	$ 12,000.00
Florida A & M University	Utilizing University Resources in Cooperation with the Tampa Model Cities Project in a Program of Community Development and Public Service	$ 6,900.00
	Total (1969)	$ 33,900.00
	1970	
University of Miami	The Cuban American Culture Program	$ 9,600.00
University of Miami	Self-Awareness, Motivation, and Creativity -- A Strategy for Change	$ 26,278.66
Florida A & M University	Utilizing University Resources in Cooperation with the Tampa Model Cities Project in a Program of Community Development and Public Service	$ 19,100.00
	Total (1970)	$ 54,978.66
	GRAND TOTAL - PROBLEM AREA I	$152,288.56

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Institution	Program Title	Federal Funds
Problem Area II - Urban-Rural Public Administration		
	1966	
University of Miami	An Urban Extension Coordinating Center	$ 45,000.00
Florida State University	Leadership and Planning Seminars	$ 7,138.00
University of Florida	Community Planning, Public Officials	$ 18,750.00
	Total (1966)	$ 70,888.00
	1967	
University of South Florida	Management Development for City and County Officials	$ 3,090.11
Florida State University	Leadership and Planning Seminars	$ 15,714.00
University of Florida	Training for County Officials	$ 3,691.00
University of South Florida	Establishment of a Center for Urban Studies	$ 15,399.17
Florida Keys Junior College	Community Leadership Development and Education for Public Responsibility	$ 3,280.00
	Total (1967)	$ 41,174.28
	1968	
Florida State University	Leadership and Planning Seminars	$ 11,720.00
University of Florida	A Training Program in Personnel Management for Owners, Managers, and Supervisors of Agricultural Enterprises and Agriculturally Related Industries	$ 8,500.00
Florida Institute of Technology	Community Service Project Through Education and Research - Task II - River Pollution Studies and Training	$ 5,000.00
	Total (1968)	$ 25,220.00

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Institution	Program Title	Federal Funds
Problem Area II (cont.)	1969	
University of Miami	Urban Applied Research and Coordinating Services	$ 15,000.00
Florida State University	Leadership and Planning Seminars	$ 12,000.00
Florida Keys Junior College	Community Leadership Development and Education for Public Responsibility	$ 2,000.00
Florida State University	Urban Development Education Workshops	$ 10,065.00
University of South Florida	Land Use and Urban Planning Program	$ 20,000.00
	Total (1969)	$ 59,065.00
	GRAND TOTAL - PROBLEM AREA II	$196,347.28
Problem Area III - Education for Economic Development and Full Time Employment		
	1966	
Florida State University	Urban Internship Program (Urban Extension Service)	$ 35,000.00
University of Florida	Economic Counseling and Research Service for Small Counties	$ 25,000.00
University of South Florida	TV Series - Consumer Education	$ 3,000.00
University of South Florida	Pre-School and Kindergarten Short Course	$ 3,937.00
	Total (1966)	$ 66,937.00
	1967	
University of Florida	Labor and Management Relations--Problems in Agriculture and Related Industries	$ 19,050.00
Florida State University	Urban Internship Program (Urban Extension Service)	$ 16,600.00

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Institution	Program Title	Federal Funds
Problem Area III (cont.)		
University of Florida	Economic Counseling and Research Service for Small Counties	$ 22,000.00
	Total (1967)	$ 57,650.00
	1968	
Florida State University	Urban Internship Program	$ 30,000.00
University of Florida	Economic Counseling and Research Service for Small Communities	$ 40,000.00
Miami-Dade Junior College	Cooperative Education for Dropouts	$ 29,000.00
	Total (1968)	$ 99,000.00
	1969	
Florida State University	Urban Internship Program - Urban Extension Service	$ 20,000.00
University of Florida	Economic Counseling and Research Service for Small Communities	$ 25,000.00
Florida Junior College at Jacksonville	Proposal for a Two-Year Demonstration Project of a Community Guidance and Counseling Center	$ 5,000.00
Miami-Dade Junior College (South Campus)	Cooperative Education for Dropouts	$ 5,000.00
	Total (1969)	$ 55,000.00
	1970	
Miami-Dade Junior College (South Campus)	Cooperative Education for Dropouts	$ 35,000.00
	Total (1970)	$ 35,000.00
	GRAND TOTAL - PROBLEM AREA III	$313,587.00

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Institution	Program Title	Federal Funds
Problem Area IV - Human Resource Development		
	1966	
University of Miami	A Program for the Continuing Education of Women in Contemporary Urban Miami, Florida	$ 3,235.00
Florida State University	Center for Women	$ 15,000.00
University of Florida	A Survey and Pilot Project to Meet the Educational Needs of Senior Citizens in an Urban Area	$ 17,025.00
Brevard Junior College	Citizenship Foundation Program	$ 10,000.00
Indian River Junior College	Continuing Education for Retired Persons	$ 20,000.00
Marymount College	Total Women	$ 10,350.00
	Total (1966)	$ 75,610.00
	1967	
University of Miami	A Program for the Continuing Education of Women in Contemporary Urban Miami, Florida	$ 34,200.00
University of Florida	A Survey and Pilot Project to Meet the Educational Needs of Senior Citizens in an Urban Area	$ 4,759.00
Brevard Junior College	Citizenship Foundation Program	$ 14,141.50
Polk Junior College	A Program for the Educational Enrichment of Senior Citizens in Polk County	$ 14,319.72
	Total (1967)	$ 67,420.22
	1968	
Daytona Beach Junior College	A Project to Extend the Program for the Educational Enrichment of Senior Citizens of Volusia County	$ 6,981.00

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Institution	Program Title	Federal Funds
Problem Area IV (cont.)		
University Miami	A Program for the Continuing Education of Women in Contemporary Urban Miami, Florida	$ 4,500.00
Florida State University	Program for the Continuing Education of Women	$ 13,000.00
Brevard Junior College	Citizenship Foundation Program	$ 10,000.00
Indian River Junior College	Continuing Education for Retired Persons	$ 10,000.00
Miami-Dade Junior College	Enrichment of Living Program for Aged Residents of Nursing and Retirement Homes	$ 14,619.00
Florida State University	A Training Institution to Prepare Public School and Other Administrators, Counselors and Teachers for the Educational Development of Older Citizens	$ 5,055.00
	Total (1968)	$ 64,155.00
	1969	
University of Miami	A Program for the Continuing Education of Women in Contemporary Urban Miami, Florida	$ 10,000.00
Edison Junior College	Education for Retirement Program	$ 5,000.00
Florida State University	A Training Institute to Prepare Public School and Other Administrators, Counselors, and Teachers for the Educational Development of Older Citizens	$ 10,000.00
Indian River Junior College	Continuing Education for Retired Persons	$ 8,000.00
	Total (1969)	$ 33,000.00
	1970	
Brevard Junior College	Parent Education Program to Strengthen Family Life	$ 9,471.00

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Institution	Program Title	Federal Funds
Problem Area IV (cont.)		
Miami-Dade Junior College (North Campus)	Educational and Recreational Programs for Administrators, Professional, and Non-Professional Staff and Residents of Long-Term Health Care Facilities	$ 23,463.20
Florida State University	Technical and Professional Development Institute for Correctional Educators	$ 19,146.00
Florida State University	A Training Institute to Prepare Public School and Other Administrators, Counselors, and Teachers for the Educational Development of Older Citizens	$ 20,000.00
	Total (1970)	$ 72,080.20
	GRAND TOTAL - PROBLEM AREA IV	$312,265.42

Problem Area V - Education and Community Welfare

1968

Florida A & M University	Building for Successful Marriage and Family Life	$ 23,246.00
University of South Florida	Environmental Design in Housing for the Elderly	$ 2,800.00
Edison Junior College	Adult Continuing Education for Florida State Prisoners - College Level	$ 2,238.00
	Total (1968)	$ 28,284.00

1969

Santa Fe Junior College	Unified Interdisciplinary Action for Increasing Mobility of Community Disadvantaged	$ 25,000.00
	Total (1969)	$ 25,000.00

1970

Santa Fe Junior College	Cooperative Child Care Program for Community Disadvantaged	$ 27,500.00

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Institution	Program Title	Federal Funds
Problem Area V (cont.)		
University of South Florida	Tutorial Program for Underachieving Disadvantaged	$ 20,000.00
	Total (1970)	$ 47,500.00
	GRAND TOTAL - PROBLEM AREA V	$100,784.00

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS AND FUNDING BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, FY 66-70

Funding Year	Type of Institution and Amount of Funds*			
	Public University	Private 4-Year Institution	Public Junior College	Private Junior College
1966	(8) $123,850.00	(4) $ 51,096.00	(2) $ 30,000.00	(1) $10,350.00
1967	(9) 120,303.28	(3) 62,935.50	(3) 31,741.22	(0) ---
1968	(9) 142,978.90	(3) 12,655.50	(6) 72,838.00	(0) ---
1969	(7) 103,965.00	(4) 52,000.00	(6) 50,000.00	(0) ---
1970	(4) 78,246.00	(2) 35,878.66	(4) 95,434.20	(0) ---
TOTALS	(37) $570,343.18	(16) $214,565.66	(21) $280,013.42	(1) $10,350.00

*Figures in parentheses indicate number of programs.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS AND FUNDS BY STATE
DESIGNATED PROBLEM AREAS FY 66-70

Problem Area	Number of Projects Primary Area	Percent	Funding Primary	Percentage Allocation of Funds
Human Relations and Minority Groups	13	17.3	$ 152,288.56	14.8%
Urban-Rural Public Administration	16	21.4	196,347.28	18.3%
Education for Economic Development and Full-Time Employment	15	20.0	313,587.00	29.2%
Human Resource Development	25	33.3	312,265.42	29.1%
Education for Community Welfare	6	8.0	100,784.00	8.6%
TOTALS	75	100.0	$1,075,272.26	100.0%

TYPES OF PROJECTS

Other than the placing of projects by problem area, it is possible to classify each project according to the following:

1. Projects designed to impart technical information through conferences, institutes, or short courses aimed at professional, business, and educational clientele.

2. Projects designed to educate the general public, to provide cultural-educational experiences aiming to improve the quality of life for urban and rural populations alike of all ages.

3. Projects designed to enable citizenry to identify social and personal problems, to choose goals, devise or adapt plans and organize and carry out the plans necessary to achieve these goals.

4. Projects designed to enable institutions to assess the wants and needs of organizations, groups, and the community at large in an effort to plan programs that would meet these needs.

CONTINUATION FUNDING

TABLE 4

PROJECTS FUNDED FOR MORE THAN ONE YEAR

Project	Institution	Years 66	67	68	69	70	Total Allocation
Problem Area I - Human Relations and Minority Groups							
Cuban Refugee	UM	x	x	x	x		35,126.00
Human Affairs	UM	x	x		x		26,626.00
Tampa Model Cities Community Development	FAMU				x	x	26,000.00
Problem Area II - Urban-Rural Public Administration							
Urban Research Activities	UM	x			x		60,000.00
Leadership and Planning Seminars	FSU	x	x	x	x		46,572.00
Community Planning Public Officials	UF	x	x				22,441.00
Community Leadership Development	FKJC		x		x		5,280.00
Problem Area III - Education for Economic Development and Full Time Employment							
Economic Counseling and Research Service	UF	x	x	x	x		112,000.00
Urban Internship Program	FSU	x	x	x	x		101,600.00
Cooperative Education for Dropouts	MDJC			x	x	x	69,000.00
Problem Area IV - Human Resource Development							
Women's Program	UM	x	x	x	x		51,935.00
Center for Women	FSU	x		x			28,000.00
Senior Citizens Program	UF	x	x				21,784.00

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Project	Institution	Years 66	67	68	69	70	Total Allocation
Problem Area IV (continued)							
Continuing Education for Retired Persons	IRJC	x		x	x		30,000.00
Citizenship Foundation Program	Brevard JC	x	x	x			34,141.50
Training Institute to Prepare Administrators, Counselors, and Teachers of Senior Citizens	FSU			x	x	x	35,055.00
Problem Area V - Education and Community Welfare							
Child Care Program for Community Disadvantaged	Santa Fe JC				x	x	52,500.00

SIMILAR PROJECTS

The following is a listing and brief outline of projects within problem areas that were similar in objectives and target group.

1. Urban Extension Coordinating Center (UM)
   Center for Urban Studies (USF)

   Establishment of a center through which efforts could be directed toward determining the needs and problems of the urban area and directing efforts toward their solution.

2. Leadership and Planning Seminars (FSU)
   Community Planning Public Officials (UF)
   Community Leadership Development (FKJC)
   Management Development (USF)

   Workshop programs designed to enable participants (usually community leaders) to identify, understand, and seek solutions to the problems of the urban area. Use of community development consultants or specialists who helped participants develop skills necessary to cope with problems that exist in their community.

   The target audience for these projects were predominantly persons active in local government.

3. Economic Counseling and Research (UF)
Urban Internship Program (FSU)
Urban Development Educational Workshops (FSU)

Planning and implementation of educational workshops to design and conduct community action projects aimed at solving community problems. Emphasis is on educational programs.

4. Women's Program (UM)
Center for Women (FSU)
Total Woman (Marymount)

These programs were geared to encourage and assist women in continuing their education as a means of solving the problems involved ir adopting new life patterns.

Accomplished by means such as information center, conferences, institutes, career fairs.

5. Continuing Education for Retired Persons (Indian River JC)
Project to Extend Educational Enrichment for Senior Citizens (DBJC)
Enrichment of Living Program for Aged (MDJC)
Educational Enrichment of Senior Citizens (Polk JC)
Education for Retirement (Edison JC)

Establishment of centers and courses to help retirees and senior citizens gain a meaningful and useful self concept in solving their problems and to assist them in acquiring new interests, knowledge, and appreciations. These projects are also seeking to help older citizens better understand the nature of the community's problems and the contributions they can make to their solutions.

GEOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS

The distribution shows that 86.6 per cent of the projects were sponsored by institutions located in five of the state's sixty-seven counties. The remaining 13.4 per cent of the projects were sponsored by institutions located in seven additional counties. It should be noted, however, that many of the programs funded were statewide in scope, while others involved more than one county.

Of the sixty institutions of higher education in the state, only seventeen had projects funded. The total number of institutions submitting proposals throughout the 1966-1970 period was 27. The total number of proposals submitted was 173.

There is a total of thirty counties in the state that have a recognized institution of higher education, and, even though all were eligible and urged to participate, only 40 per cent of these counties were directly involved through an institution of higher education in a Title I funded project.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS AND FUNDING BY COUNTIES FY 1966-1970

County	Institution	No. of Projects	Per Cent	Funding Allocation	
Leon	Florida State U.	15	25.4	$240,438.00	
	Florida A & M U.	4		57,903.90	
	Total	19			$ 298,341.90
Dade	U. of Miami	15	26.6	209,565.66	
	Miami-Dade JC	5		107,082.20	
	Total	20			$ 316,647.86
Alachua	U. of Florida	10	16.0	183,775.00	
	Santa Fe JC	2		52,500.00	
	Total	12			236,275.00
Hillsborough	U. of S. Florida	7	9.4		68,226.28
Brevard	Brevard JC	4	6.6	43,612.50	
	FIT	1		5,000.00	
	Total	5			48,612.50
Palm Beach	Marymount	1	2.7	10,350.00	
	Fla. Atlantic U.	1		20,000.00	
	Total	2			30,350.00
Lee	Edison JC	2	2.7		7,238.00
Indian River	Indian River JC	3	4.0		38,000.00
Polk	Polk JC	1	1.3		14,319.72
Volusia	Daytona Beach JC	1	1.3		6,981.00
Monroe	Florida Keys JC	2	2.7		5,280.00
Duval	Florida JC at Jacksonville	1	1.3		5,000.00
TOTALS		75	100.0		$1,075,272.26

(It should be noted that many of the programs funded were statewide in scope, while others involved more than one county.)

( ) Number of Projects

Fig. 1.--Locations of institutions sponsoring projects.

TABLE 6

COUNTIES: FUNDING AND POPULATION

Counties With Institutions of Higher Education	No.	Counties in Which Funded Institutions Are Located	No. of Projects	Estimated 1968 Population of Each County
Alachua	1	X	12	95,000
Bay	1			69,000
Brevard	2	X	5	230,000
Broward	2			504,000
Columbia	1			25,000
Dade	5	X	20	1,145,500
Duval	4	X	1	514,800
Escambia	2			195,600
Highlands	1			25,500
Hillsborough	4	X	7	460,000
Indian River	1	X	3	34,500
Jackson	1			36,600
Lake	1			65,400
Lee	1	X	2	83,200
Leon	3	X	19	91,000
Madison	1			14,800
Manatee	1			83,500
Marion	1			65,000
Monroe	1	X	2	62,000
Okaloosa	1			86,000
Orange	5			318,000
Palm Beach	4	X	2	304,300
Pasco	1			52,000
Pinellas	2			454,000
Polk	4	X	1	239,500
Putnam	1			33,900
St. Lucie	1			49,500
Sarasota	2			104,000
Seminole	1			73,000
Volusia	4	X	1	167,000
TOTALS	60	12	75	5,691,600

PRESENTATION OF DATA -- TABLES

Introductory Statement

The data presented in the following tables were compiled from responses to questions in the progress and evaluation reports as submitted by project director and/or others responsible for the reporting.

The data must be analyzed in light of the fact that: (a) Many reports lacked complete information regarding the age, social class, and level of education of participants; (b) Others reflected contradictory and ambiguous information, and some reports contained no information on this subject; and (c) Many reports did not indicate the number of participants who completed the project in contrast to the number initially enrolled.

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY SEX: 1966-70

Sex	Number	% of Total
Male	8,599	15.0
Female	36,826	64.1
Not indicated	12,000	20.9
Totals	57,425	100.0

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY AGE: 1966-70

Age Range	Number	% of Total
Under 21	1,866	6
21-44	6,731	21
45-64	4,203	13
Over 65	2,465	8
Not indicated	16,810	52
Totals	32,075	100

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY EDUCATION LEVEL: 1966-70

Level	Number	% of Total
8th Grade	713	1.7
High School	4,580	10.7
College	5,573	13.1
Advanced Study	1,512	3.5
Not Known	30,297	71.0
Totals	42,675	100.0

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY SOCIAL CLASS: 1966-70

Class Level	Number	% of Total
White Collar	7,289	17.9
Blue Collar	1,240	3.0
Service	525	1.3
Farm	---	---
Not Known	31,712	77.8
Totals	40,766	100.0

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY PROBLEM AREA: 1966-70

	Problem Area	Number	% of Total
I	Human Relations and Minority Groups	10,401	21.8
II	Urban-Rural Administration	1,786	3.7
III	Education for Economic Development and Full-Time Employment	1,300	2.7
IV	Human Resource Development	34,263	71.6
V	Education and Community Welfare	91	.2
	Totals	47,841	100.0

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS BY PROBLEM AREA AND SOCIAL CLASS: 1966-70

	Problem Area	Class	Number	% of Total
I	Human Relations and Minority Groups	White Collar	5,501	77
		Blue Collar	826	12
		Service & Farm	---	--
		Not Known	791	11
		Total	7,118	100
II	Urban-Rural Administration	White Collar	440	100
		Blue Collar	---	---
		Service & Farm	---	---
		Not Known	---	---
		Total	440	100
III	Education for Economic Development and Full-Time Employment	White Collar	373	100
		Blue Collar	---	---
		Service & Farm	---	---
		Not Known	---	---
		Total	373	100
IV	Human Resource Development	White Collar	972	3.0
		Blue Collar	289	1.0
		Service & Farm	644	2.0
		Not Known	28,778	94.0
		Total	30,683	100.0
V	Education and Community Welfare	White Collar	12	15.4
		Blue Collar	16	20.5
		Service & Farm	48	61.5
		Not Known	2	2.6
		Total	78	100.0

The results of the evaluation are presented below in such a fashion as to reflect and encompass the major findings of the information provided predominantly by questionnaires directed to project directors throughout the state.*

OBJECTIVES

Central to the success of any program is the degree to which the objectives of that program are identified, understood, and accomplished. As one of our measures for determining the probable success of projects funded, we examined the objectives of each program with respect to the following: (1) persons involved in determining the objectives for each project; (2) the clarity with which the objectives or intended outcomes were stated; (3) changes in objectives during the project; and (4) extent to which project objectives reflected the goals of the federal and state plans.

Our findings with regard to involvement in determining objectives show that in 75 per cent of the projects, the project director, community leaders, and project staff worked together to determine program objectives (which was the desired outcome of the legislation). The institutions should be commended for this. Of the remaining 25 per cent, the target audience was involved in almost half of the projects. The remainder had objectives determined by the project director only.

Measurement of the success or failure of a program is dependent upon clearly stated intended outcomes. In this review, the evaluators found through the questionnaires that 29 per cent of the projects had clearly stated and defined objectives, 57 per cent had objectives that were stated in general terms such as goals or purposes, and in 14 per cent of the projects we were unable to identify the program objectives in terms of intended outcomes.

We found that in 68 per cent of the projects the original objectives were not changed or altered at any time during the project. The remaining 32 per cent reported alterations or changes in the original project objectives. Project directors reporting changes or alterations indicated that these occurred in response to the needs of the target audience or as a result of realizing the need to be more practical.

Of major importance to this study was the extent to which projects reflected the objectives and guidelines of the state plan. This was determined by reviewing the manner in which the projects accomplished the following: (1) strengthened the institution's community service program, (2) contributed to the solution of a community problem, (3) involved community leaders in planning the project, (4) disseminated the project findings to the appropriate publics, and (5) conducted a realistic and appropriate evaluation of the projects.

With regard to item (1) above, our questionnaire responses indicate that only 35 per cent of the projects contributed to this end. Nearly all project

(Copies of questionnaires available from State Agency upon request.*)

directors felt that their projects were effective in regards to item (2) above. Eighty-six per cent of the project directors reported planning of projects in consultation with community leaders. This corresponds with our findings drawn from our review of project application forms which identifies persons involved in planning the project. Less than 25 per cent of the projects complied with item (4) above. In addition, a majority of the projects did not make provision in their proposals for this purpose. Our questionnaire results and files kept on each project show that 75 per cent of the projects planned and conducted evaluations appropriate to each project.

PLANNING

The Florida state plan suggests as one of its guidelines that identification and selection of a problem or need for a project occur through consultation with community leaders rather than by the project director himself. This guideline is to emphasize that projects be based on actual community need rather than institutional need or interest.

The questionnaire responses to the manner in which the problem or need of the community was identified provided the following data. In the vast majority of the projects the problem or need was identified by means of the project director consulting with leaders in the community. Of these, approximately half also employed surveys, questionnaires, and census information to document the legitimacy of the problem or need.

In 14 per cent of the projects, the need or problem was identified solely by the project director. In the majority of these projects documentation was of a general or theoretical nature.

We lack appropriate data to attempt any correlation between success or failure of projects and the method used for determining the problem or need. However, the data collected regarding problem or need identification were sufficient to suggest that some projects were funded that lacked appropriate documentation of the need for such projects.

The questionnaire also provided data on the actual selection of a problem or need for which a project would be designed. Sixty-eight per cent of the projects report that problem or need selection was made by the project director in consultation with community leaders, while the remaining 32 per cent report selection made solely by the project directors.

The data lead us to conclude that the majority of the projects funded were legitimate responses to identified community problems or needs, a fact which represents the successful attainment of this goal.

TARGET GROUP

Our utmost concern regarding the target group was to: (1) determine if the actual participants were the same as those for whom the project was intended. This was a difficult task, and, as our results indicate, we were not altogether successful. Another concern was to (2) determine whether or not the participants felt that the project had helped them achieve their own objectives, and (3) to what degree participants were involved in project planning.

We were unable to obtain sufficient questionnaire responses from target group members, so it was necessary for us to rely on the interviews conducted with selected target group members and staff of different projects. The results of the interviews indicated that most of the participants felt that they were accomplishing personal goals and obtaining satisfaction as a result of their participation. It was found that the participants were involved in planning their program to a certain extent. Some of the interviewees expressed minor complaints regarding teaching procedures, administrative policies, etc. Others felt the project was successful, and that it was helping to solve a community problem.

It was not possible to determine whether or not the projects involved the "intended" target group, that is, those whom the project "stated" they were going to serve in the original proposal. To determine this would have entailed a more comprehensive survey including more participants and community leaders than time allowed for. For those projects involved in disseminating information and providing routine educational experiences, i.e., courses, conferences, institutes, seminars, there is little doubt that they reached the appropriate target audience. However, the disadvantaged, the aged, and illiterates may not have been reached with the same degree of accuracy. Our assumptions for stating this rests on: (1) the relative difficulty of identifying "hard core" target groups, and (2) the unwillingness of most "hard core" target groups to participate in educational programs.

FUNDING

An attempt was made to determine how funding procedures were viewed by individual project directors. In order to obtain comments and criticisms, if any, concerning the relationship between project directors and the State Coordinator regarding funding, i.e., time, purpose, limitations, etc., a number of questions were posed. The two most fundamental questions were: do institutions fully understand conditions under which funding occurs? and, is the communication between the state director's office and the project director such that any lack of, or inadequate dissemination of, relevant information a consequence in the success or failure of a particular project?

It was found through questionnaires used that most of the project directors received sufficient information about criteria for funding from the State Coordinator's office. However, three project directors indicated no

knowledge that Title I money was to be used as seed money, and two indicated no knowledge of the fact that Title I funded projects were to be "cooperative" in nature. Six project directors indicated no knowledge of the fact that Title I projects were to "maximally" utilize staff and personnel from their institution. Moreover, seven project directors indicated no knowledge of the fact that Title I funds were not to be used for creating a new branch or service of the institution.

By and large, the great majority of project directors viewed their relationship with the State Coordinator as quite favorable in all matters concerning dissemination of appropriate information, assistance with administrative problems, and so forth. The State Coordinator was seen as "expediting project goals," "providing relevant information," and being "cordial, cooperative and helpful."

COMMUNICATION

One of the important variables regarding the measure of success or failure of any project is the degree and relative consistency of the communication flow between the institution and the community, interest groups, and/or target groups it seeks to change. It is assumed that the greater the actual involvement of participants, the more likely change will occur both effectively and cognitively.

With this as our guideline, an attempt was made to determine what percentage of the projects engaged in a meaningful exchange of ideas, information, etc., with other educational institutions and community agencies/organizations--either directly or indirectly related to the project. It was not our purpose to specifically measure the quality of the communication flow, but to get an indication of the effects it had on project objectives, goals, methods, the extent of participant involvement in planning, and in the changes in curriculum or content.

FINDINGS

Results showed that 57 per cent of the projects communicated with various agencies who were conducting similar programs in a particular problem area funded under Title I. Over 95 per cent of the project directors responding to our questionnaire indicated they were fully aware that their project was to be carried out in cooperation with other community agencies. The nature of communication was illustrated by the following responses:

Sixty-five per cent of the project directors indicated that they worked directly with community agencies in planning and organization, and at the same time provided training facilities, and served as resource personnel. Only one project director indicated no involvement at all with community agencies in regard to the above relationships. The remaining 34 per cent of the project directors indicated that their institution provided one of the above services.

An indication of the "quality" of the above communication was obtained through an open-ended question. It was possible to rate the responses into three categories of (1) very effective, (2) moderately effective, and (3) ineffective. Results showed that 67 per cent of communication fell into the first category, 18 per cent in the second, and 15 per cent in the latter category.

Results indicate that 98 per cent of all projects informed the community of their efforts principally through the mass media. The newspaper was the most widely used source of communication, followed by radio and TV. Following these, other methods such as the use of brochures, newsletters, and bulletins were used. All projects relied on two or more or all of the above-mentioned media simultaneously. Seventy-five per cent of the projects deemed it necessary to publicize their program before it got underway, and at some point after the project began.

In an attempt to determine how well "tuned in" the institution was to the community or surrounding environment, the degree of feedback from the community to the institution was taken as a measure of a project's flexibility and desire to change in light of new information and ideas. In about 70 per cent of the projects, it was estimated that information provided through feedback resulted in the planning of additional programs and courses. Only two projects indicated that they did not utilize new, incoming information, and as a result had no effects on programming, etc. While feedback resulted in the establishment of new courses, only four projects indicated that feedback caused changes in ideas, methods, and techniques.

FOLLOW-UP

1. Seventy-five per cent of projects indicated that followup activity was carried out by the institution involved.

It was found that most of the followup studies were initiated by the project director in league with staff and resource personnel. The remaining followup activities were initiated by the project director in league with target group personnel and community leaders.

2. Of the many types of followup activities engaged in, the most prevalent was the conference-workshop type, which was used in almost half of the projects, to determine the effects of their program, its content, methods, techniques, etc. The use of courses, either planned or in progress, was used in one-fourth of the projects as the main mode of their followup. The remaining projects indicated the use of radio and/or TV, group action, publication, and public service projects as followup activities.

PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

The "total" effect of Title I funding in terms of strengthening the Department of Continuing Education or the community service programs of the institutions concerned is indicated in a variety of ways. Questionnaire responses indicate that 35 per cent of projects had an effect on changing the status of the department within the institution, while the remaining 65 per cent indicated no change whatsoever. This is further exemplified by the fact that only 28 per cent of the projects made additions to their staff, allowed them to employ more qualified staff, or made possible additional opportunities for staff training.

For those projects which indicated that their efforts led to further creation of new courses, programs, etc., within the institution, the majority of project directors indicated a number of changes that occurred. For example, many directors indicated the formation of committees involving community members for the purpose of planning subsequent courses, conferences, etc. Others indicated that their project stimulated fresh thinking about the objectives of their own department, and others indicated the continuation of the same program for the following fiscal year. Results indicate that new courses were offered in slightly over one-half of the institutions as a result of the project. Moreover, the project also stimulated a substantial amount of research-oriented activities in over one-third of the total number of projects. One of the most favorable results of the survey was derived from the fact that about 60 per cent of the project directors indicated their program would be able to continue after Title I funding was terminated. Title I funding was not utilized by institutions to create new departments of continuing education or otherwise, according to the information collected.

The ability of the Title I project to solve or contribute to the solution of a community problem was indicated by the responses of project directors. Nearly all indicated that their project provided the target group with sufficient knowledge to cope with the problem. Sixty-seven per cent indicated their project helped the target group "mobilize" personnel and community resources in order to effectively lay the groundwork for planning and organization. Also, the same percentage indicated that their project helped their institution develop new and improved ways of responding to community problems. Nearly all of the project directors saw their project as helping to reduce the problem. Only two saw their project as not being of any value to the solution of a community problem.

Participation in the project by members of the target group was fairly extensive throughout most of the projects. Target group members assisted in developing objectives for the program. Results of the questionnaire indicated that in the opinion of the project directors over 95 per cent of the participants viewed the project as helping to reduce the problem, a point which indicates another goal successfully attained.

EVALUATION

The Florida state plan lists evaluation of project effectiveness as one of its objectives, suggesting that all projects should include as part of

their design and their budget appropriate evaluation procedures. A condition of funding is that an evaluation be conducted. The following findings report on evaluations conducted, number of times, methods used to evaluate, and use of evaluation data.

The data that provide the following findings were drawn from two sources: (1) questionnaire to project director, and (2) files kept on all projects in the office of the state coordinator.

Seventy-five per cent of the projects planned and conducted an evaluation, fourteen per cent planned but did not conduct an evaluation, and no information was available regarding evaluations for the remaining eleven per cent.

Of the 75 per cent that conducted an evaluation, 86 per cent of these did so once, and the remaining 14 per cent did so twice.

Evaluation techniques were participant reaction forms: 57 per cent; personal interviews: 16 per cent; examinations or tests: 11 per cent; and self-evaluation techniques: 16 per cent.

Through use of the questionnaire, we attempted to determine from the project directors what use was made of the information gained from the evaluations. We found that in 86 per cent of the projects that conducted an evaluation the information was used to assist the project directors and staff in planning future programs. In the remaining 18 per cent, the information was shared with the participants to help them understand their participation in the project. Additional uses of evaluation information reported are: to determine grades and credit, as feedback to project staff; as reports to the Title I state coordinator, and to the administration of the sponsoring institution.

ROLE OF TITLE I STATE COORDINATOR

In addition to reviewing Title I projects in the state as they relate to the federal and state plans, we were also interested in examining the role of the state coordinator.

The state plan does not clearly identify the responsibilities of the state coordinator other than routine administrative matters, making it difficult to examine his role in light of pre-determined objectives. However, a job description for this position by the Division of Academic Affairs provided some guidelines.

1. Coordinate the Title I Program of the U.S. Office of Education with the institutions of higher education in Florida.

2. Coordinate the Title I Program of the institutions of higher education with the U.S. Office of Education.

3. Plan comprehensive program to attack major problem in the state utilizing resources of institutions of higher education as reflected in the state plan.

4. Evaluate the effectiveness of programs funded; identify problems and deficiencies, and develop recommendations for solutions of problems and correction of deficiencies.

5. Evaluate and recommend appropriate action of proposed new programs submitted by institutions of higher education each year with the State Advisory Committee.

6. Develop cooperative inter-institutional programs and cooperative efforts when possible to resolve problems reflected in the State Plan for Title I.

7. Assist institutions in planning and developing programs to be considered for funding.

Our review and evaluation of the state coordinator's role are based upon the above job description, interviews with project directors, and our evaluation of the state program.

Correspondence records, interviews, and our evaluation show that the state coordinator has been extremely effective in fulfilling items 1, 2, 3, and 5 listed above.

Attempts have been made to accomplish item 4, but according to our judgment they have fallen short of their goal.

Interviews with project directors showed that they did not see item 6 as a valid role for the state coordinator.

There is very little data available to base a judgment on item 7.

Our interviews with project directors and staff provided the following information regarding the state coordinator: He is viewed as a disseminator of information regarding Title I, and he is viewed as one who relates mostly to project directors.

Project directors were very pleased with the ease of obtaining requested information and with the thoroughness of information sent to them by the state coordinator.

COOPERATIVE AGENCIES AND PROJECTS

An indication of community involvement is the extent of participation in projects by local, state, and federal agencies. With the exception of certain projects as institutes, conferences, or short-course programs, the goal of involving other agencies was accomplished in the projects funded.

Following is a brief representative sample of the kinds of agencies most likely to be involved according to problem area.

I. Human Relations and Minority Groups

Public school board, Rotary, Industrial Commission, U. S. Department of Labor -- There seems to be no typical agency or organization associated with this problem area, but rather the type of agency involved is determined by the particular objectives of the project.

II. Urban-Rural Administration

Most projects in this category involved large universities such as Florida State University, the University of Florida, the University of Miami, The University of South Florida, and were continuation projects. Therefore, the project tended to be more institution-centered and less reliance was placed on outside community agencies. Those agencies utilized predominantly were: Florida State Employment Service, county boards of education, and specific business and/or management associations particular to the objectives of the project.

III. Education for Economic Development and Full Time Employment

Since most of the projects in this problem area were carried out at large universities and were continuation programs, they used their own university resources to a large extent. Some outside agencies were: Florida Industrial Commission, Regional Planning Councils, consumer organizations, United States Employment Service.

IV. Human Resource Development

Predominant community agencies were county departments of health, citizens' advisory boards, county school boards, and Department of Welfare.

V. Education and Community Welfare

County boards of education, Florida State Employment Service, Department of Welfare and Rehabilitation were the major agencies involved in projects in this problem area.

COMMENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

OBJECTIVES

The data regarding objectives point out that target audiences or participants had little involvement in determining project objectives. In our opinion, project objectives were rather poorly composed, a fact which creates a question in our minds as to the ability of the project directors to effectively measure the success or failure of their programs.

We conclude that one of the Federal objectives outlined in the legislation--that of strengthening the institution's community service program--did not receive sufficient emphasis in the Florida program. (According to the State Coordinator, the U. S. Office of Education personnel did not emphasize this as a major objective.) One of the State Plan objectives--that the findings of projects be shared with the appropriate publics--was also not achieved.

Because of the limitation of not being able to interview participants and community leaders of the majority of the projects, we cannot firmly conclude that the majority of the projects contributed to the solution or alleviation of a community problem.

COMMUNICATION

The data shows that communication between institutions sponsoring projects and community agencies was extensive and effective.

Communication with the general community was also quite extensive indicating that the institutions were sensitive to keeping the community informed of the progress of the project. Most efforts were, however, aimed at soliciting greater participation from the community and publicizing the accomplishments that were being made. Very few projects made attempts to provide the public with an overall report or resume of the effects of the project after the project terminated. The fact that many projects were continuation programs (17), and a good number being institutes or conferences, helps to account for this factor.

It is apparent that feedback was widely utilized, but in a limited way. Its main function was to reinforce the existing methodology and philosophy underlying the project with the result that although new programs were initiated, it is our opinion that they were not dissimilar to past programs. We find little indication that feedback initiated novel approaches or stimulated extensive re-evaluation of various aspects of the program. The results indicate to us that the vast majority of projects viewed the information obtained from the feeback procedures as a necessary step in the development of their program, and not as a vehicle to initiate new approaches, different techniques, etc.

The majority of projects obtained their information from interviewing participants and/or community leaders. The next approach most widely used to obtain feedback was meetings and conferences. The third approach, the least employed, was questionnaires and surveys.

EVALUATION

Our attempt to determine the effect of the program on participants was inhibited by the fact that evaluation reports did not provide this information. The available reports contained demographic information, discussions on the program, and verbal reactions from participants. At times this information made interesting reading, but did little to help us determine whether the objectives of the projects were achieved.

We have found inadequate evaluation reports to be a major weakness of Title I funded projects.

STATE COORDINATOR

There seems to have been little or no attempt by the state coordinator to develop cooperative institutional programs.

The plan calls for a coordinated attack, through Title I projects, on five major problem areas designated in the state. The extent of coordination seems to have halted at the stage of defining the problem areas. The institutions of higher education have not taken the initiative to coordinate their efforts on solving major problems, and we believe that this is a function of the state coordinator that to this date has not been fulfilled.

The Federal Act and the state plan have put forth the mandate that the Title I program be a coordinated statewide attack on community problems, but to date only 17 institutions out of a possible 60 have had programs funded. Slightly more than one-third of the eligible institutions have submitted projects for funding.

In order for Title I to be effective in attacking the major problems on a statewide basis, a concerted effort must be made to encourage all eligible institutions of higher education to design and submit programs that will make an attack on these problem areas. This should be a major responsibility of the state coordinator.

The office of the state coordinator is essentially a one-man operation. The successful accomplishment of the Title I state plan for Florida requires a larger professional staff.

COOPERATIVE AGENCIES

Certain institutions working in certain problem areas tend to rely on the same kinds of community agencies. In most projects, most institutions and agencies indicated a high degree of coordination throughout the program, but the intensity of such efforts were focused on the planning and organizing stage of the project, with only a modicum of interaction taking place during the project (the diversity of projects must be kept in mind).

EVALUATION CRITERIA

These criteria have been developed for use by the Advisory Committee in the future. They were not used during the current evaluation.

INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS

> "The community involvement and services effort of an institution must be judged in terms of its impact on the community, in terms of how the community or its citizens are better off or have changed behavior as a result of service programs."
>
> --Nathan C. Shaw and J. Kenneth Cummiskey

The nature of the Title I program for a state suggests that an evaluation of individual projects should concern itself not only with whether or not changes occurred in participants, or a community problem was solved, but also with the process involved in achieving the project objectives.

More specifically, concern must be given to the means used to achieve the objectives and it is on the basis of these two components that the evaluation criteria for individual projects was established.

I. Identification of Actual Problem or Need

A. The problem area should be adequately identified in terms of well-documented evidence, i.e., surveys, reports, census information, etc.

B. The problem area of the state plan to which the project is directed should be clearly defined.

C. The project should clearly indicate in what ways it will attempt to fulfill the identified need or how it will assist in solving the identified problem.

II. Involvement of Community Leaders and Participants

A. There should be an indication of involvement of community leaders in planning and coordination.

B. There should be an indication of involvement of target group members in setting program and/or course objectives along with project planning.

C. There should be an indication of the utilization of feedback from target group and community leaders.

III. Objectives

A. The objectives should be stated in specific terms ard be measurable in terms of intended outcomes.

B. The objectives should indicate measurement of short-term and long-term results.

C. The objectives should clearly state how and under what conditions target group members will be involved.

D. The objectives should be realistic in terms of the capabilities and particular limitations of the institution involved, i.e., facilities, staff, physical plant, etc.

E. The objectives should indicate a well-conceived plan of sequentially based activities, carefully planned and ordered.

F. The objectives should be realistic in terms of the knowledge possessed regarding the target population, i.e., in line with their intellectual capabilities, i.e., whether or not they will be able to make use of the new learnings.

IV. Communication and Cooperation

A. The institution conducting the project should enlist the advice, services, and/or expertise of other institutions throughout the state.

B. The institution should cooperate with community agencies working in similar problem areas, i.e., illiteracy, education for retired.

C. Channels of communication should be opened for dissemination of information from the institution to the community at large, i.e., newspapers, TV, radio, etc.

D. The need for cooperation with the state coordinator's office should be inidicated.

V. Followup

A. There should be an indication of the "type" of followup procedures to be used, i.e., courses, workshops, meetings, questionnaires.

B. There should be an indication of "frequency" of followup, i.e., once, twice, or more after completion of project.

C. There should be an indication of the results of followup, i.e., change in future program planning, alterations in methods, techniques, etc.

VI. Evaluation

A. There should be mention of specific pre-program and post-program evaluation procedures.

B. There should be an indication of "how" evaluation is to occur, i.e., methods to be employed.

C. There should be an indication of the frequency of evaluation.

D. There should be an indication of how evaluation results are to be utilized in program.

VII. Target Audience

A. There should be an indication the program is aimed at the specific group or community who illustrate a need.

B. There should be reasonable assurance that the target audience will be reached.

C. There should be an indication of geographic location (if possible, of target audience and boundaries indicated, i.e., rural, urban, ghetto, suburbs, farm areas, etc.)

VIII. Staff

A. There should be an indication of the number of staff needed to fulfill project objectives.

B. There should be an indication of the competence and capabilities of the staff (teachers, consultants, etc.) in regard to past experience.

C. Staff duties and responsibilities should be as clearly stated as possible.

D. Staff salaries, expenses, and amount of time to be spent in project should be as specific as possible.

IX. Dissemination of Information

A. The dissemination of results of the project to the general public should be planned for.

B. Provisions should be made for dissemination, i.e., newsletters, brochures, TV advertising, etc.

X. Preventative Duplication

A. Provisions should have been made to see that the proposed project is not a duplication of similar projects either being planned or in progress in same problem area.

XI. Contribution of Project to Solution of Community Problems

A. Participants should be better off for having participated in the program.

B. Some changes in the behavior or attitude of the target audiences should be attibutable to participation in this program.

C. The change should be as positive as possible.

D. Participation in the program should assist the target audience in solving their problems.

TITLE I STATE PROGRAM

Effective functioning of any program requires two basic components. The first is a clearly defined future condition and the second is a built-in system of evaluation and feedback.

The Federal Act and the Florida state plan for Title I, Higher Education, 1965, have made an honest effort to achieve component one, but considerable flexibility of interpretation has hindered its full accomplishment.

The second component, a built-in system of evaluation and feedback, has been minimal in the State of Florida program.

Component one has been discussed in the recommendations and summary of our evaluation report and will not be dealt with here. This section of the report will direct itself to setting forth criteria for an evaluation and feedback system for the state plan of Title I, Higher Education Act, 1965.

An evaluation need not be a complex process that requires specialists for its administration or interpretations of the findings. With this in mind, we propose the following criteria for evaluating a state-administered Title I program.

I. Strengthening of the Institution's Community Service Program

A. To what extent and in what manner have the community service programs of the institutions receiving Title I funds been strengthened, i.e.,

1. The institutions should now be able to offer services to the community that they did not offer before.

2. They should indicate whether receiving Title I funds has enabled them to employ additional qualified community service staff.

3. There should now be greater interaction between the community service program department and the community than existed prior to these institution's receiving Title I funds.

II. Assist in the Solution or Alleviation of Identified Community Problems

A. Are the problems or needs identified in the projects real ones or are they based on intuition, interest, or speculation of project directors?

B. In what ways have projects contributed to the solution or alleviation of community problems, i.e.,

1. The problems have been eliminated or lessened.

2. The participants are now able to cope more effectively with the problem.

3. The participants are now more actively engaged in working on a solution to the problem.

C. Were the methods and techniques used in projects effective, i.e., were they the most satisfactory for accomplishing the objectives of the projects?

III. Impact of Projects on Problem Areas Defined in the State Plan

A. Are problem areas receiving equal attention, i.e.,

1. There should be some semblance of balance in the number of projects funded in each problem area.

2. The amount of funds allocated in one problem area should not be considerably greater than the other areas.

3. The sub-areas defined within each problem area should receive reasonably equal attention.

B. Have the projects funded within each problem area significantly reduced or altered these areas as statewide problems?

C. Do other institutions or agencies not receiving Title I funds view Title I as having made a significant contribution to the major community problems of the state?

IV. Relationship of Projects to the Purposes and Objectives of the State Plan

A. Are problem areas for projects identified in cooperation with community leaders and target audiences?

B. Are the projects educational in design?

V. Institution and Geographic Distribution of Projects

A. Is there a clustering of projects in a relatively few geographic areas of the state or are projects distributed evenly throughout the state?

B. Is there an even distribution of projects among the institutions of higher education or are there relatively few institutions conducting most of the projects.

C. Are projects within the various problem areas attacking the problems in the various areas throughout the state where the problem is manifest or are only a few locations throughout the state receiving assistance?

VI. Involvement of Institutions of Higher Education

A. Are all institutions of higher education within the state informed of the possibility of receiving Title I funds?

B. Are only those institutions that have adequate community service programs and resources receiving Title I funds?

C. Has any attempt been made to encourage or assist those institutions of higher education that have small or weak programs of community service?

D. What is the percentage of the total number of institutions of higher education within the state that are conducting Title I projects?

VII. Functions of the State Coordinator and the Advisory Committee

A. Is the state coordinator communicating effectively with the representatives of the institutions of higher education in the state?

B. Are the activities of the state coordinator designed to enable him to guide the Title I efforts toward a coordinated attack on the major problem areas identified in the state plan?

C. Is the state coordinator in close contact with all institutions of higher education within the state so that he is aware of their community service program efforts?

D. Does the state coordinator attempt to coordinate efforts of institutions conducting projects in similar problem areas?

E. Are members of the advisory or project approval committee adequately familiar with all aspects of Title I?

F. Does the advisory or project approval committee devote sufficient time to a study and review of projects submitted for approval?

G. Is the project selection progress unified and systematic, or is it haphazard?

H. Is project approval based on a set of objectively established criteria or is it based on subjective criteria?

VIII. The State Plan

A. Are the problem areas identified in the state plan relevant?

B. Is the state plan flexible enough to encompass newly identified problem areas?

C. Are the objectives of the state plan clearly identified?

D. Does the state plan provide for an evaluation that can adequately measure the degree of accomplishment of its objectives?

IX. Inter-Institutional Cooperation

A. Is there cooperation and/or coordination among institutions receiving Title I funds conducting similar projects?

B. What is the nature and extent of cooperation by institutions receiving Title I funds with other institutions and agencies within the community (as it relates to projects funded under Title I)?

X. Funding

A. Have Title I funds been used as seed money or has it been used to maintain new community service departments or programs?

B. Are funds being allocated to projects that should more appropriately be funded by some agency other than Title I?

XI. Dissemination of Information

A. Has any effort been made to disseminate the results or findings of projects to the appropriate publics, i.e.,

1. Related community serving agencies should be included in the dissemination effort.

2. Other institutions of higher education interested in a particular problem area should also be included.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made. It is hoped they will provide sufficient focus on those areas most in need of improvement and change.

1. Proposal and Evaluation Reports

There is a need for more precise clarification of project objectives stated in specific measurable terms. Proposals should strive toward this goal.

Individual projects need to provide more complete demographic and personal data on participants. This goal could be achieved by periodic assessments over the duration of the program. The evaluation report should be revised in order to reflect accurately participant enrollment, demographic data, and other data pertinent to the unique nature of the project. Caution should be taken not to collect unneeded data.

2. Institutional and Geographic Distribution of Projects

Efforts need to be made in obtaining a more equal representation of institutional involvement in problem areas throughout the state. More institutions should partake in Title I. An appropriate goal of Title I funded programs would include a more equal geographic distribution of projects. Institutions need to extend their services into adjacent counties if need be.

3. Problem Areas

There is a need for institutions to provide services and focus their attention on some of the neglected sub-problem areas designated in the state plan. Capable institutions should direct their efforts to more than one, or even two, problem area(s). Of importance in this regard is the selection of projects by the advisory committee who has the responsibility of allocating funds to institutions which on the whole reflect a balanced attack on problem areas in the state.

4. State Plan

Serious consideration should be given to periodic revision of the scope and content of the designated problem areas. In the interests of keeping up with societal changes, the problem areas must be reviewed in order to assure the identification of contemporary social and economic problems.

A more efficient and effective attack on the community problems of the state should be facilitated by developing priorities that are the result of thorough research on existing and future problem areas.

5. Evaluation

Efforts should be directed toward improving individual project evaluations. Emphasis needs to be placed on measuring behavioral changes through well designed questionnaires or interviewing techniques. This could be facilitated by periodic evaluations conducted at strategic points throughout the program.

A yearly evaluation report pertaining to the overall progress of the target group noting appropriate changes should be seriously considered by sponsoring institutions.

6. Office of the State Coordinator

The office of the state coordinator should assume a more active role in coordinating the efforts of the various institutions in attacking the major problem areas outlined in the state plan. A more concerted effort needs to be taken by the state coordinator to involve institutions of higher education submitting proposals for funding. In addition, assistance should be offered to these institutions in developing community service projects that would help to achieve the goals of Title I.

To engage in these functions, the office of the state coordinator should employ additional professional staff.

7. Advisory Committee

A more effective and efficient system for approving projects should be employed by the advisory committee. One possible system would consist of a review committee and an approval committee. An evaluation of this system can be found in the report "Guidelines for Project Approval and Evaluation Criteria."

The committee should meet more frequently for the purpose of reviewing the progress of Title I and for designing means for guiding its direction. This would suggest appointment of members who are thoroughly familiar with the purposes of Title I and who are willing and able to commit time to furthering the accomplishment of these purposes.

8. Institution and Community Service Agency Cooperation

The cooperative relationship of institutions of higher education and community serving agencies with respect to Title I projects should extend beyond the normal relationship. By this, we mean that the agencies should provide more than verbal support for a project. The sponsoring institution should seek cooperation in the form of staff time, facilities, and finances. In addition, the institutions of higher education receiving funds should develop a strong relationship with community service agencies for the purpose of identifying and attacking community problems.

9. Action Oriented Programs

A greater emphasis needs to be placed on community service action programs that involve appropriate target populations. Considerable effort has been made to provide programs for professionals and leaders in communities. A shift in emphasis is suggested.

10. Dissemination of Information

An effort should be made by the office of the state coordinator to insure that project findings are disseminated to the appropriate publics within the state. Emphasis should be placed on interchange of information among institutions conducting similar projects.

ERIC Clearinghouse
JAN 2 8 1971
on Adult Education